

Appln No. 09/801,949

Amdt date April 8, 2005

Reply to Office action of February 8, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-2, 4-19, 21-36, and 38-52 will now be pending in this application upon entry of the above amendments. Claims 3, 20, and 37 have been canceled. Claims 1, 10, 18, 27, 35, 44, and 52 have been amended. The amendments find full support in the original specification, claims and drawings. No new matter has been added. In view of the above amendments and remarks that follow, reconsideration, reexamination, and an early indication of allowance of the now pending claims 1-2, 4-19, 21-36, and 38-52 are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 6, 8-9, 18, 23, 25, 26, 35, 40, and 42-43 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shirley et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,692,206). Claims 2, 4, 19, 21, 36, and 38 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shirley in view of Rutten et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,632,251). Claims 3, 10-17, 20, 27-34, 37 and 44-51 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shirley in view of Rutten, and further in view of Kuo (U.S. Patent Pub. No. US 2003/0120615). Claims 5, 22, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shirley. Claims 7, 24, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shirley in view of Owens et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,236,984). Claim 52 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shirley in view of Crawford et. al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,502,113). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

With respect to independent claims 1, 18, and 35, these have been amended to respectively recite a method, system, and a

Appln No. 09/801,949

Amdt date April 8, 2005

Reply to Office action of February 8, 2005

computer-readable storage medium for generating and delivering documents "by a remote requestor for a recipient other than the requestor." These claims have been further amended to recite "receiving an approval message from a remote party other than the requestor or the recipient, the approval message indicating approval of the document; updating an approval status report based on the approval message; [and] transmitting the approval status report separately from the document in response to a report request." None of the cited references teach or suggest these limitations.

The Examiner relies on Kuo and Crawford to contend that it discloses an approval status document or report.

With respect to Kuo, the Examiner states that claim 1 covers the subject matter of Kuo in that the "requestor" in Kuo is the web user, that the "recipient" is also the web user, and the "document" is a web page requested by the web user. (See, Final Office action p. 35, 1st paragraph). Claims 1, 18, and 35, as amended, now recite that the recipient is "other than the requestor."

Claims 1, 18, and 35, as amended, also call for an "approval message indicating approval of the document" and "transmitting the approval status report separately from the document in response to a report request." Although the Host in Kuo approves purchase orders, it does not approve the recited "document" that is generated "according to the recipient and subject matter information responsive to a document request" received from a remote requestor. That is, the web pages that the Examiner contends read upon the recited "document" are not

Appln No. 09/801,949

Amdt date April 8, 2005

Reply to Office action of February 8, 2005

approved by the Host in Kuo. Furthermore, nothing in Kuo teaches or suggests "transmitting the approval status report separately from the document in response to a report request." (Emphasis Added). Accordingly, Kuo fails to teach or suggest the amended limitations of claims 1, 18, and 35.

With respect to Crawford, Crawford discloses a summary page that tracks negotiating activity between contracting parties. However, the negotiating activity in Crawford is necessarily the activities of the contracting parties. Nothing in Crawford teaches or suggests "receiving an approval message from a remote party other than the requestor or the recipient, the approval message indicating approval of the document." Furthermore, nothing in Crawford teaches or suggests that the disclosed summary pages are transmitted "separately from the document in response to a report request" as is required by amended claims 1, 18, and 35. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 1, 18, and 35 are now in condition for allowance.

Independent claims 10, 27, and 44, have been amended to recite limitations that are similar to the limitations of claim 1, which make claim 1 allowable. Accordingly, claims 10, 27, and 44, are also in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 52 has also been amended to recite limitations that are similar to the limitations of claim 1, which make claim 1 allowable.

Claim 52 has further been amended to recite "transmitting to the remote computer over the computer network a notification indicative of the generated final document, the notification being transmitted separately from the generated final document."

Appln No. 09/801,949

Amdt date April 8, 2005

Reply to Office action of February 8, 2005

As indicated by the Examiner, any notification disclosed by Shirley is simply displaying the generated contract with the incorporated data. (See, Final Office action, p. 24, 4th full paragraph). Nothing in Shirley nor any of the other cited references teach or suggest the recited "notification" that is "transmitted separately from the generated final document."

In addition, amended claim 52 recites "displaying on the remote computer a plurality of available transmission modes" and "receiving from the remote computer identification of one of the plurality of available transmission modes." Although the Examiner contends in the Final Office action, on page 28, last paragraph, that Crawford teaches that a user may send a contract to another via e-mail, nothing in Crawford teaches or suggests "displaying on the remote computer a plurality of available transmission modes" and "receiving from the remote computer identification of one of the plurality of available transmission modes" as is now required by claim 52. Accordingly, claim 52 is now in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, reexamination, and an early indication of allowance of the now pending claims 1-2, 4-19, 21-36, and 38-52.

Appln No. 09/801,949


Amdt date April 8, 2005

Reply to Office action of February 8, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By


Josephine E. Chang
Reg. No. 46,088
626/795-9900

JEC/lal

FRS PAS612306.1--04/8/05 6:02 PM